

**Remarks**

Applicant's representative would like to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on August 31, 2007.

The various parts of the Office Action are discussed below under similar headings.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112***

The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and fourth paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 13 has been amended for clarity by replacing the term "such as" with "including". Accordingly, the rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,091,482 to Carter in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,118,584 to Van Berkel et al. The Examiner also rejected claims 9-10 and 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter in view of Van Berkel and further in view additional prior art.

Claim 1 is the sole independent claim. Claim 1 has been amended to include selecting a two-dimensional pattern and providing a merged image template wherein the template and the pattern comprise a multiplicity of cells, each cell having  $n$  regions (wherein  $n$  is the number of prepared base images) and the regions in each cell are arranged in a non-linear pattern. In view of the above amendments, the Examiner's prior rejections are now believed to be moot.

Carter and Van Berkel relate to lenticular display systems. In particular, Carter relates to a lenticular lens process that produces interlaced image plots for conveying various desired visual effects when the image plots are printed and viewed through a properly positioned and aligned sheet of lenticular lens material (Carter at Col. 1, lines 13-20). Van Berkel groups display elements together so as to partly overlap one another in the column direction so that when the display elements are viewed through a lenticular screen, a merging effect is obtained during the transition from one image to another image. (Van Berkel at Col. 2, lines 14-48).

The amended claims distinguish patentably from lenticular display systems, such as those disclosed in Carter and Van Berkel. Typically, lenticular display systems are used to provide graphical effects (e.g., simulate motion, merging of images, etc.) to a plurality of images. In operation, as a viewer moves in relation to the lenticular display, the focal point of the individual lenses changes to show one image after another. Only images or image portions that fall beneath the focal point of the individual lenses are displayed at any given time due to the physical configuration of the lenses, which are elongate, parallel, optically cylindrical converging lenses. Thus, in order to view the various images, a linear pattern of image portions is needed to align properly with the lenticular display to provide the desired result.

Referring to Figure 9 of Carter, the image components in the merged image are oriented linearly. As the viewer moves in front of the image with lenses, different portions of the merged image are displayed, which simulates a moving image. For example, as the viewer moves in front of the image with the lenses, different portions of the merged image are displayed. For example, a viewer moving from right to left would view A1 and A2 through lens 20A and A11 and A12 through lens 20B etc. to view image A. The viewer would view B3, B4 and B5 through lens 20A and B13, B14 and B15 through lens 20B, etc. to view image B. This process would continue for images C and D, respectively.

Likewise, referring to Figure 9 of Van Berkel, the display elements are grouped together in groups of nine with the elements of each group being contiguous in the row direction by positioning the elements in three rows. (See Col. 9, lines 33-52). Thus, the corresponding display elements related to an image or a portion of an image are linearly displaced in order to function properly in the lenticular display system. That is, display elements 1-9 are linearly displaced and aligned with the lenticular display throughout the display in order to view the various images to be obtained the desired result.

As amended, claim 1 includes selecting a two-dimensional pattern and providing a merged image template wherein the template and the pattern comprise a multiplicity of cells, each cell having  $n$  regions (wherein  $n$  is the number of prepared base images) and the regions in each cell are arranged in a non-linear pattern. Arranging the regions in a non-linear pattern distinguishes amended claim from the prior art of record. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 distinguishes patentably over Carter either alone or in combination with Van Berkel. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-19 are dependent on claim 1. As explained above, none of the teachings of the cited references when combined with Carter and Van Berkel have been found to disclose or reasonably suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above for claim 1. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 2-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, request is made for timely issuance of a notice of allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to further prosecution of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By /Timothy E. Manning/  
Timothy E. Manning, Reg. No. 48,964

1621 Euclid Avenue  
Nineteenth Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
(216) 621-1113

M:\C\CULLIP\IP0179\PO179US.R07.wpd v2.wpd